



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

V. MERIBATH-KADESH.

ANCIENT writings were written for a motive, and, however enlightened the writer may have been, they are intended to portray events in the light in which they were regarded in his time, either by himself or by the circle on whose behalf they were undertaken. They may or may not be absolutely credible, but it is necessary in the first instance to realize that the existence of a literary work implies some definite aim or object. Further, it is important for the critic to recognize the presence of the religious factor in the composition of history, for not only does every writer arrange his material in order to give effect to a special view, but he handles it from some specific religious standpoint. So, every piece of writing bears the impress of its age, and has been subject to the manifold influences from which no record is free. It treats of the past in accordance with the requirements of the present, and will often prefer to represent the present in the past in order to furnish authority and precedent for that which is contemporary. As Kuenen has appositely remarked:—

“In ancient time and specifically in Israel, the sense of historical continuity could only be preserved by the constant compliance on the part of the past with the requirements of the present, that is to say its constant renovation and transformation. This may be called the law of religious historiography. At any rate it dominates the historical writings alike of the Israelites and of the early Christians¹.”

In dealing with records of remote events, therefore, many questions constantly arise: are the records contemporary, are they authentic, or do they depend upon sources which are not only not contemporary, but embody later tradition; if so, can the earlier traditions be recovered; do they show signs of redaction, and if so, for what purpose has the redaction apparently been made? Abundant illustration of growth and redaction of tradition is to be found in the account of the Exodus from Egypt and the entrance into the land of Canaan, and that portion which requires consideration in these notes may serve

¹ Kuenen, “The Critical Method,” in the *Modern Review*, I (1880), p. 705.

to exemplify methods which naturally were not restricted to the Pentateuch.

From the results of the critical analysis it will be obvious that many centuries intervened between the age to which these events are attributed and that in which the narratives reached their present form. It has been placed beyond all reasonable doubt that they extend down into the post-exilic period, and it is necessary to bear in mind that the final redaction was made subsequent to the religious regeneration of Israel after the return from the exile. The writings of a Nehemiah or of an Ezra throw only incomplete light upon the internal movements of this post-exilic age—at the epoch when most is to be expected, the relevant records are slight—but we may look for the Judaism of that period in the contemporary re-writing and redaction of the old traditions with as much confidence as we may treat the “Little Genesis” or Book of Jubilees as material for the internal thought of a few centuries later. Hence, it is found that, for the purposes of critical study, the post-exilic records and the post-exilic narratives of the Exodus and Conquest illustrate one another and are mutually supplementary.

Now, if the return from the exile was fresh in the minds of post-exilic writers, this was only one of the great issues in the history of Israel which could exercise influence upon the course of tradition. Even within the body of P itself, there are signs of important modifications, and it is almost impossible to estimate with any certainty how many currents of thought had previously affected the traditions of the great national event. There is sufficient evidence that the founding of the nation was an epoch to which later ages ascribed the initiation of their institutions, so that the narratives became the vehicle for the views and ideals of later generations. Of earlier stages, the Deuteronomic reform is the one that can be most clearly traced, and one is thereby entitled to assume that earlier changes in Hebrew religion and thought must have left their mark *somewhere* upon the earlier writings. Thus, one is compelled to believe that the influence of such a movement as that associated with Elijah and Elisha would assuredly affect any records which existed in writing in their age.

But it would be a mistake to suppose that it is only in religion and ethics that we are to expect modification and development. A considerable amount of fluctuation is to be found in the narratives (that is, in the history from the view-point of the writers); some of the variations in important details are very striking, and when one considers the differences between the Deuteronomic and post-exilic traditions it is scarcely likely that the many centuries which separate even the former (D) from the events themselves have not witnessed

equally noteworthy developments. There was time enough for boundaries to shift, and for the familiar sites to be the scene of other movements, for tribes to grow and to die out, and for tribal traditions to be grafted on to one and the same national stock¹. But when the attempt is made to investigate the traditions in their earlier pre-Deuteronomic form, many almost insoluble difficulties at once present themselves, and whilst we can utilize the evidence of Deuteronomy to estimate the work of the latest redaction (P), for the extent of earlier revisions we must depend upon internal evidence and general considerations of continuity and the like.

Now, one is so accustomed to consider the detour to the south of the Sinaitic peninsula as an integral stage in the Exodus from Egypt that many only half-concealed indications which point to a different tradition are often apt to be overlooked. The itinerary of forty stations in Num. xxxiii (agreeing with the number of the years of wandering) is so freely admitted by modern critics to be one of P's lists that it cannot claim the attention which it has so often received, and any theory of the Israelite route, instead of relying upon the characteristically dry and lifeless enumeration (familiar enough in P's writings), should concern itself primarily with the older and more lively narratives with their description of the events of the march. A brief consideration of these is necessary².

The incidents, taken *seriatim*, comprise the following:—

(a) Immediately after the destruction of Pharaoh's army in the *Yam Sûph*, the Israelites proceed to the wilderness of Shur and march three days without finding water. On reaching *Mârâh* ("bitter") the waters were found to be undrinkable and were sweetened, and *there* (a change of source has been suspected) a statute and judgment (טִּבְעֵי) were given, and he (i.e. Yahweh) *tested him* (נִסָּהוּ). This reference to Shur (Exod. xv. 22 sqq.) brings us at once to a familiar district, associated with Hagar (Gen. xvi. 7)³ and with Abraham (xx. 1); one which, from the parallel story of Isaac (xxvi. 1), at some

¹ The topographical questions alone are serious when one recalls the Goshen in Egypt and S. Palestine; the *Yam Sûph* in the Aelanite Gulf; the possibility of the extension of the name *Musri-Mizraim* beyond the borders of Egypt, and the surely not infrequent incursions of tribes from north Arabia.

² For full critical details reference must be made to recent critical literature; special mention may be made of Addis, *Doc. of Hexateuch*; Bacon, *Triple Trad. of the Exodus*; G. F. Moore, "Exodus" and "Numbers" (in *Ency. Bib.*); G. B. Gray, *Numbers*; and Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch* (here referred to as *Hex.*).

³ In the parallel narrative, Hagar is on the point of dying of thirst (Gen. xxi. 15 sqq.).

period, at least, was regarded as belonging to the Philistines (contrast Exod. xiii. 17). Further, it is important to observe that the wilderness of Shur was evidently part of the district occupied by the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv. 7, xxvii. 8), and that the scene of the law-giving in question is evidently in the neighbourhood of Kadesh (see Gen. xvi. 7, 14), if not at Kadesh itself. For Kadesh, as its name En-mishpat ("well of judgment," Gen. xiv. 7) shows, seems to have been famous as an ancient centre of legislation, and the suggestion that, according to one tradition, the Israelites journeyed direct to Kadesh finds some support in Judges xi. 16, in the specific allusion to the "testing," and in a number of other points of detail which will be noticed below. This being so, it is noteworthy that the period of three days agrees precisely with the intention expressed in Exod. v. 3, viii. 27 (cp. iii. 18).

(b) It is to P that Exod. xvi in its present form is due, but it is undeniably based upon old material, and provides an interesting example of the manipulation (and mutilation) of existing tradition. The fact that the manna was sent to *test* (נִסָּה, ver. 4) the people to see whether they would walk in the Law presupposes a law-giving, and indirect allusions to the ark (vers. 32-34) and sanctuary (ver. 9; in ver. 10 for "wilderness") point to a later context. In fact, recent critics agree that the whole episode is based upon a duplicate of the incidents recorded in Num. xi, and should follow the Sinaitic covenant. The gift of manna belongs most naturally to the later wanderings in the desert (cp. Deut. viii. 3 and 16). See below (i).

(c) A similar displacement has been effected in the account of the miracle performed at Massah and Meribah. P locates it at Rephidim, xvii. 1 *a*, whilst a glossator has anticipated by the insertion of "in Horeb," ver. 6. The whole passage is composite, and the problem is complicated by the very close relation to Num. xx. 1-13. In the latter story, however, the scene is Meribah, to be identified with Kadesh (Num. xx. 1, 13, xxvii. 14; cf. Meribath-Kadesh, Ezek. xlvii. 19, xlviii. 28), whereas the source incorporated in Deut. ix. 22 (cp. vi. 16) treats Massah as a distinct name. The union of the two names in Exod. xvii. 7 appears to have arisen from the fusion of two sources in which Massah in the one case, and Meribah in the other, were associated with a similar story. But whilst there can be no doubt that Meribah ("contention" or "striving") is properly a Kadesh locality, there is only a very strong presumption that Massah ("testing," "proving," &c.) belonged originally to the same district¹.

¹ Note above in *a* the proving or "testing" associated with the "judgment."

For the present, however, it is at least clear from a comparison of Deut. ix. 22 with Num. xi that any allusion to Massah is out of place in its present context.

(d) The account of the defeat of Amalek in xvii. 8-16 is due to E—probably a secondary source¹—and like the preceding episodes is marked by certain peculiarities which indicate a much later point in the narratives: Moses is no longer able to sustain the outstretched rod, and Joshua, formally introduced in xxxiii. 11 as a young man in attendance upon Moses, is now a trained captain. The relation between the two, therefore, represents a more advanced stage, *after* the institution of the Tent of Meeting. In addition to this, the mention of Amalek associates itself with Num. xiv, where the Israelites are at Kadesh. Not in the peninsula of Sinai or near the Gulf of Akabah, but to the immediate south of Palestine does this people belong, and whilst we might expect to find them in the wilderness of Shur (*a* above), many critics agree that they are out of place in their present context².

(e) Even the composite account of Jethro's visit to Moses (Exod. xviii) cannot belong rightly to its present context. Although the scene is apparently Rephidim (unidentified, xvii. 8, xix. 2), ver. 5 places it at the "mount of God" (Horeb-Sinai, cp. already xvii. 6). But the narrative implies a settled encampment and the possession of laws; its tenor suggests the last stage in the sojourn at Horeb, and it is significant that this is precisely the point at which the tradition in Deuteronomy (i. 9-17) assigns the institution of judges and officers³. So the usual critical view, but since the holy mountain was already near Jethro's home (iii. 1), his journey "unto the wilderness" (ver. 5) and his return "unto his own land" (ver. 27) seem to imply that the original scene of this visit was not Sinai-Horeb. See further below on Num. x. 29 sqq. (*g*).

(f) The chapters that follow comprise the Sinaitic theophany, legislation, and covenant, continued by a great mass of material of post-exilic date, which extends (Exod. xxxii-xxxiv excepted) from Exod. xxv to Num. x. 28. It has already been seen (*b*) that P builds upon old material⁴, and it is important to bear in mind that even as

¹ Without the recognition of secondary sources in both J and E, the literary criticism of the Exodus can make no progress.

² In view of the repeated references to מִצְרַיִם and מִצְרָיִם , there is a possibility that the name of the altar Yahweh-nissi (יְהוָה-נִסִּי) was thought to be connected with Massah.

³ Note, however, the development of the tradition; Deut., l. c., makes no reference to the part played by Jethro.

⁴ Cp. also P in Gen. xxxv, see *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 539 sq.

P's laws and institutions are not all of post-exilic origin, so his narratives may be the development of early tradition. For example, Exod. xxxiii. 7-11 abruptly introduces us to the Sacred Tent, a dwelling which cannot possibly be the elaborate building already described by P. Together with Deut. x. 1-5 and Num. x. 33, it presupposes some *old* preliminary explanation of the tent and ark, on which account it is extremely probable that P's sources in the preceding chapters have taken the place of older matter dealing with similar topics. Thus it will be seen that although P gives us the post-exilic representation of the older traditions, and although it is not always possible to determine precisely how much of his material is applicable to the earlier ages, his sources can be of great assistance in any attempt to reconstruct the general trend and context of early tradition¹. In these circumstances, it will evidently be important to observe how P's source continues after his account of the preparations for the sanctuary. (See below.)

(g) The older sources are resumed in Num. x. 29 sqq., where we once again meet with the father-in-law of Moses. This associates itself with the misplaced narrative, Exod. xviii (e), and it will be seen that if that chapter stood in the present context the internal difficulties (already noticed) would vanish. Both narratives agree in demonstrating the dependence of Moses upon his father-in-law, and the relative antiquity of Num. x. 29 sqq. shows itself most prominently when it is compared with Exod. xxxiii, where it is not a human

¹ Similarly, although the chronicler writes in accordance with the religious standpoint of his age to such an extent that his records are of little value for the study of religious life under the monarchy, it would be uncritical to reject the traditions he has re-written or incorporated without subjecting them first to careful and unbiassed investigation. And in criticizing his historical evidence it is necessary to bear in mind the scantiness of our earlier historical sources. The Book of Kings itself contains only a selection from the material accessible to the compilers, and there is no sound reason why certain portions of the Book of Chronicles should not be based upon or developed from equally reputable sources. If the conviction can be maintained that P, however un-historical in his present form, has *developed* rather than *invented*, it will be difficult to deny that the chronicler has proceeded upon the same lines. On general grounds, moreover, it seems unreasonable to suppose that a writer should take the trouble to invent, when a mass of tradition (whether oral or written) must have been in circulation. Not to pronounce upon the credibility of individual points of evidence, but to collect and classify all related material, must be the first step in historical study, and it is, perhaps, too often assumed that the earlier books are necessarily more credible than the later.

but a divine guide whose help is required. In spite of its brevity it is of unique value, since Hobab's clan is subsequently met with in Judges i. 16, whence it appears that in spite of his disinclination he was induced to accompany the wanderers. The passage is properly a torso; it breaks off with tantalizing suddenness, and only allows us to infer that some account of Hobab's journey once existed in writing and that this record has been superseded in favour of another by some early editor¹. The passage undoubtedly belongs to the same context as *f* (Exod. xxxii-xxxiv) and the scene must be Sinai-Horeb (ver. 33), but Hobab's proposal to depart to his own "land" and "kindred" (מולדתו) agrees with Exod. xviii. 27, and tends to deepen the impression that the original scene was neither Sinai nor Horeb. Even P's narrative in Num. x. 12² states that the wilderness of Sinai had been left and that the Israelites were in the wilderness of Paran, and although this source seems to have located the latter to the south of Kadesh (but cp. xiii. 3 and 26), there are some indications that this is merely to give effect to a particular view which is not original. In point of fact, the narratives now under consideration are the result of a peculiarly complicated process; it is not enough to agree with many recent critics that *a-e* are misplaced, it is also necessary to observe how persistently incidents are placed at a stage before Kadesh is reached when definite features suggest that their original position was at Kadesh itself.

Several important events have been crowded into Num. xi. No details are preserved of (*h*) the "burning" at Tab'erah (תַּבְּעֵרָה, Num. xi. 1-3), but the reference has every appearance of being based upon the meaning of the place-name. Such aetiological allusions (cp. Massah, Meribah and Marah) in other fields of historical investigation would naturally be treated with great reserve³.

(*i*) In the composite narrative of the manna and quails, the institution of the seventy elders is to be kept quite distinct, its relation to portions of Exod. xxxiii being indisputable. The story (which serves to explain the name "Graves of Lust") is evidently akin to P's narrative in Exod. xvi, and both ignore the view that the Israelites were supplied with herds and flocks (Exod. xvii. 3, xix. 13,

¹ The meaning of the "three days" in Num. x. 33 is obscure, but cp. Exod. xv. 22 (see end of *a*).

² Vers. 13-28 being secondary (see *Hex.*, p. 200), vers. 11, 12, or their original, once stood immediately before ver. 29.

³ On the assumption that an early source recounted an appropriate incident one might be tempted to refer to the story of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. x. 1-5), or of Korah's revolt (Num. xvi), but these are at present in a different context, and of post-exilic origin. See, however, below.

xxiv. 5, xxxii. 6, xxxiv. 3, Num. xx. 19). The tradition in Deut. ix. 22 refers to acts of provocation at Taberah, Massah and Kibroth-hattaavah, and since the last is clearly connected with the provision of quails it is extremely probable that the gift of manna was originally associated with Massah. That Exod. xvi. 4 contains a specific allusion to the *testing* or *proving* of Israel has already been seen ¹.

(j) The next decisive incident is the sending of the spies (xiii. sq.), the scene of which is Kadesh (xiii. 26, Deut. i. 19, 46) ². This should hold good, also, of the revolt of Korah (xvi. sqq.), and is explicitly stated in the case of Num. xx (see *k*). But according to P, Kadesh is reached for the first time in xx. 1, and for this and other reasons some transposition of the narratives may be suspected. By placing the sending of the spies after the revolt and before xx. 14 sqq. a more natural sequence is obtained, and the account of the unsuccessful attempt to push northwards is thus followed by the preparations for the journey through Edom ³.

(k) In Num. xx is recorded a story of "striving," a duplicate of that in Exod. xvi. 1-7 (see *c*). In some obscure manner Moses and Aaron did not *sanctify* (קִדְּשׁ) Yahweh in the eyes of Israel, whence the place was called the "waters of Meribah" because the children of Israel "strove" (רָבַחַ) with Yahweh, and he showed his holiness among them " (וַיִּקְדֹּשׁ בָּם) —an unmistakable allusion to the name Kadesh. It is difficult to determine from the narrative the nature of the sin of which Moses and Aaron were guilty. Cornill has suggested that it was some act of open rebellion and takes the words "hear, ye rebels" in ver. 10 to have been addressed originally by Yahweh to the leaders. There is also a possibility that the story with its allusion to rebels (מְרִיבִים) was associated with Marah (מָרָה, see above *a*), but in the nature of the case this cannot be proved ⁴. However, there are other allusions to offences by Moses and Aaron, and on inspection it is found that all appear to be related in an extremely perplexing manner. For example, from Deut. i. 37 it seems that in one tradition Moses incurred

¹ From another nuance of the root comes the idea of "tempting," to which Deut. vi. 16 and Ps. lxxviii. 18 refer.

² According to Deut. i. 22 the spies were sent at the request of the people; contrast Num. xiii. 1.

³ xxi. 1-3 (Israelite victory at Hormah) and the overtures to Edom are intimately connected as regards subject-matter with xiv. 41 sqq. (*defeat* at Hormah) and ver. 25. See also Bacon, p. 182 sq. The present position of *k* (before the attempt to pass Edom) finds a parallel in Exod. xvii, where its duplicate *c* precedes the defeat of Amalek. The relative value of these traditions is another question, on which see below.

⁴ However, in Exod. xv. 23 sqq., the giving of the statute and judgment follows upon the miracle at Marah (where the waters are sweetened).

the wrath of Yahweh on the return of the spies. Now since the latter event should probably be placed before xx. 14, it would thus occupy the same relative position as the story of Meribah in xx. 1-13. There is no hint of any offence of Moses in Num. xiv, as the narrative now stands, but it seems to imply that sentence had already been passed upon both Moses and Aaron. On the other hand, the chapter contains a fine description of his intercession on behalf of the rebellious people. The passage in question (Num. xiv. 11-24) has close literary contact with Exod. xxxii-xxxiv, and it is curious that the parallels occur in the account of the intercession of Moses after Aaron made the calf. These scenes, like the above, precede the commencement of a journey (Num. x. 29 sqq.), and from Deut. ix. 19 it would appear that, according to some tradition, the mediation was on behalf of Aaron. It may be that opinion was not settled regarding the specific occasion on which the divine displeasure was aroused, but there are evident signs that the traditions are not so widely separated as they at first appear.

This necessarily very brief survey will exemplify the intricate character of the narratives. There has been considerable adjustment and many stages in the growth of tradition have been preserved by the editors. Although *a* (p. 741, above) brings us at once to a law-giving in the wilderness of Shur, no covenant or legislation can reasonably be expected until Sinai-Horeb is reached. The narratives Exod. xvi-xix demand a position *after* the laws, and, although they are distributed along the route, Sinai is already the scene in xvii. 6 and xviii. 5. Subsequently it is found that although the spies are sent from Kadesh (Num. xiii. 26), this place is not yet reached in P (xx. 1), and although the incidents in Numbers (*g*, &c.) are placed either at Kadesh or on the journey thither, some points of contact with Exod. xxxii-xxxiv (apparently Sinai-Horeb) have already been found.

Although it is more than probable that certain incidents have been misplaced, it is difficult to reconstruct the form of the sources before they suffered adjustment. Nevertheless, it is clear that the connexion between the allied passages was a close one: the rock in Exod. xvii. 6 is that mentioned in Num. xx. 8; the hill in Exod. xvii. 10 finds its explanation in the allusions in Num. xiv. 40, 44, and P, in Exod. xvi, builds upon older material closely related to that which has survived in Num. xi¹. That these variants can supplement or illustrate each

¹ As a specimen of intricacy it may be noticed also that from Deut. viii. 3 and 16 one expects the manna to have been sent after the Israelites had left Kadesh and were in the "great and terrible wilderness," and certainly Num. xi is preceded by the account of the commencement of the journey (see *g* and above). But Exod. xxxii-xxxiv is apparently at

other appears notably when it is remembered that before the incorporation of P's material, Exod. xxxii-xxxiv stood in close connexion with Num. x. 29-36, xi. sqq. The passages in the former which describe the reluctance of Moses to bear the burden of the people are of the same stamp as Num. xi. 12, 14 sq., and it is only necessary to observe how appropriately these verses follow upon Exod. xxxiii. 1-3 to admit the force of Bacon's reasoning that this was their original position¹. This affords another example of the manner in which the account of the journey has been constructed, and it now becomes evident that many traditions have grown up around the commencement of *this* journey. The relation of Exod. xviii to Num. x. 29 has already been noticed (see *e* and *g*), and one is entitled to infer that the former must have been found in this context at some earlier stage in the literary history of the narratives. If it be transferred (allowance being made for redaction), not only do its difficulties disappear but we are in agreement with the tradition represented in Deut. i. 9-18, which has verbal points of contact with *both* Exod. xviii and Num. xi². Accordingly, we find that as a necessary preliminary to the journey, Moses requests the assistance of Hobab, that Jethro suggests steps to lighten the legislative duties of his son-in-law (note the special development of this in Deut. i), and that as tradition strikes a loftier note, Moses needs a divine guide, and, no longer the judge, but the recipient of the divine spirit, elects seventy elders³.

All these appear to represent successive stages in the growth of tradition, and since traces of displacement have already been found it is possible that other passages originally stood in this context. The relation of Exod. xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11 to the election of the seventy elders in Num xi is not certain⁴, but the former appears to represent a more primitive version of the incident, and some support for this belief might be found if it could be shown that Nadab and Abihu

Sinai-Horeb, and Kadesh is not reached until Num. xiii. And, finally, does the need for this food belong to the oldest traditions? See also the references above in *i*.

¹ See also Gray, p. 107.

² See Driver, *Deut.*, p. 10; Addis, ii. pp. 34 sq.

³ Note, further, the general idea of the reluctance of the leader to undertake the task; one may compare the account of Elijah at Horeb. The examples of development noticed above are especially instructive since elsewhere, where similar growth is to be expected, only isolated stages may have survived. Any narrative that happens to stand by itself may represent only one of perhaps several different views which were once current.

⁴ See Gray, p. 116.

once had a place in the context of Exod. xxxii-xxxiv (see below, p. 754).

Another incident that presumably belongs before the commencement of the journey is the story of the punishment of Miriam and the vindication of Moses (Num. xii)¹. Notwithstanding its present position at Hazeroth (xi. 35, xii. 16), it associates itself with the visit of Jethro to Moses, and is characterized by that motive of jealousy which underlies the story of the seventy elders (xi. 28 sq.). The idea of election and of the vindication of authority is met with in other passages which appear to belong to the same cycle, and it seems probable that this markedly advanced narrative of the punishment and forgiveness of Miriam is to be connected with the statement in an older source that Miriam died at Kadesh (xx. 1).

In like manner, it appears that although Aaron receives his punishment at Kadesh, one tradition knew of his narrow escape from death for his share in the matter of the golden calf, and even of Moses himself there is preserved in Exod. iv. 13-16 (at the mount of God) a curious allusion to the manifestation of Yahweh's anger in consequence of his reluctance to undertake the task imposed upon him². It is singular that, although editors have succeeded in concealing the precise offence of which Moses was guilty in Num. xx, the tradition in Ps. cvi. 33 states that he was rash or indiscreet (כַּזְזָה) at Meribah, whereas the passages which seem to hint at this are now in a context which points to Sinai.

A number of independent considerations (of varying value) tend to the view that a fundamental adjustment of the oldest traditions has been effected. Some light is thrown upon this by a critical result of extreme importance. There is reason to believe that according to P the whole of the forty years' wanderings was spent away from Kadesh; in D, likewise, the greater part of the time is spent in the inhospitable desert, whereas in the earlier sources the Israelites have their centre in the fertile and well-watered oasis of Kadesh surrounded by pasture-grounds suitable for nomads. Many details are obscure, but the dominant fact is the conclusion that Kadesh was once regarded as the permanent centre of the people³. Hence

¹ Bacon, p. 175; Gray, pp. 98, 120.

² This reluctance and the promised help of Aaron the Levite may be associated with the selection of the Levites in general (Exod. xxxii. 25 sq.), which is now placed at Sinai-Horeb. On historical grounds the latter may be the more primitive, the choice of Aaron as the representative of the Levites would mark a more advanced stage.

³ See Gray, *Ency. Bib.*, "Wanderings, Wilderness of," especially §§ 6, 15 sq.

it would be natural to assume that it occupied a very prominent place in the old sources, and it seems more likely that traditions would gather around it than around Sinai-Horeb, which was the scene of only a comparatively short stay. Now, if the old sources described the preparations for the commencement of the journey from Kadesh—and it is extremely probable on *a priori* grounds that they would—there is further presumption for the view that the stories of visits of a Jethro or Hobab, and of the reluctance of Moses, and all allied incidents were originally associated with this historic site and that the present adjustment was intended to magnify the importance of Sinai-Horeb and to treat Kadesh merely as one of the stages in this part of the journey (see below, p. 755).

It is scarcely necessary to show that the Sinaitic covenant and legislation is more advanced than the germ of the old laws in Exod. xxxiv. The latter's theophany is more primitive than that in Exod. iii and there is a distinct stamp of antiquity underlying Exod. xxxii-xxxiv which is not without significance. At present, everything is made to depend upon the story of the golden calf: the apostasy is followed by the divine wrath, the choice of the Levites, and apparently a *new* covenant. But the offence must be understood in the light of the later polemics against calf-worship and on this account can scarcely be regarded as part of the original tradition¹. At one time, however, some other motive must have existed, although when we consider the time that has elapsed between the date of the old account of the choice of the Levites and the latest redactions one can hardly expect to be able to recover the earliest details.

The leading features are (a) Aaron's share in the offence, and (b) the institution of the sacred tribe Levi. The latter was evidently once narrated at some length, since in Deut. x. 10² it is associated with the making of the ark and thus presupposes an account which is *not* the existing one in Exod. xxviii sq. (cp. Lev. viii), but probably an earlier, from which P has been developed. Now, from the "Blessing of Moses" it seems that a tradition existed that Yahweh "proved" the Levites at Massah and "strove" with them at the waters of Meribah (Deut. xxxiii. 8-11). The passage is not free from obscurity, but since it alludes to the separation of the Levites from brother and son (ver. 9, cp. Exod. xxxii. 27, 29) and implies some creditable performance, it is remarkable that it should associate the account in Exod. xxxii with the present story of Meribah in Num. xx. It must seem extremely singular that Meribah, famous for

¹ Possibly the story is not earlier than the time of Hezekiah.

² Deut. x. 6-7 have come in from another source, but the effect of the insertion is to place the event *after* Aaron's death.

some obscure offence of Moses and Aaron, should also be the scene of the institution of the Levites, and although the surviving traditions are incomplete they appear to be linked together by some definite bond. It is noteworthy that even in Exod. xxxii Aaron is blamed for the calf-worship and, according to Deut. ix. 20, would have perished but for the mediation of Moses. But the present narratives (Exod. i. c.) treat it as the sin of the whole people, and in the account of the intercession of Moses there are literary points of contact with the story of the spies (see above). Further, in Deut. i. 36 sq. Moses incurs the wrath of Yahweh on the return of the spies. Already, on the strength of Deut. xxxiii alone, we could infer that parts at least of Exod. xxxii-xxxiv were originally located at Kadesh, and if this evidence associates Levites with Meribah, it brings them into a context before Num. xx. 14 sqq., and places them in the same relation to it as the story in Num. xiii-xiv¹! It would seem that it is only on the assumption that cycles of tradition, of different dates, originally encircling Kadesh have been used to construct the present narratives and have been placed now at Sinai-Horeb and now at other stations along the route, that these phenomena admit of explanation.

It will be seen that the considerations which go to support this view proceed from a study of the subject-matter—the purely literary questions are hopelessly intricate. Here and there one can trace fairly clearly the development of the literary material², but it is extremely difficult to understand why D's account of the calf-worship (ix. 26 sqq.) should link together passages associated with the present stories of Korah's rebellion and the sending of the spies³. It may, indeed, be urged that this is the result of intentional rearrangement, or of mere reminiscence, or, again, it may be that in the early fluctuating state of tradition passages were connected now with one

¹ P, moreover, relates the death of Aaron in Num. xx. 24 sqq., and the result of the insertion of Deut. x. 6 sq. is to associate his decease with the separation of Levites. In Exod. iv. 13, when Moses had in some way aroused the wrath of Yahweh, Aaron is promised as a help, and in the story of the spies Caleb is the only one to escape punishment. To Caleb, later tradition adds Joshua, and in Exod. xvii the Massah and Meribah story (c) is followed by an event (d) in which Joshua, Aaron, and Hur (a Calebite, 1 Chron. ii. 19) play a prominent part. We shall find other cases of selection and rejection in the account of the revolt of Korah (see below), and it will be necessary subsequently to show that a relation subsisted between such apparently heterogeneous names as Caleb, Korah, Moses, Aaron, and the Levites.

² As in the insertion of Deut. x. 6 sq. (above).

³ Num. xiv. 16, xvi. 13; see, for example, the table in *Hex.*, p. 262; Driver, *Deut.*, p. 112.

and now with another of the events before the departure from Kadesh. At all events, whatever be the true cause, there is some reason for the supposition that the revolt of Korah was once intimately associated with the context of Exod. xxxii-xxxiv, and this story of rejection and selection seems clearly related to events which are located now at Sinai-Horeb, but originally in all probability belonged to Kadesh.

The critical analysis of Num. xvi sqq. has brought to light a fusion of interesting narratives all marked by the same motive: the confirmation of authority or prerogative. The composite story of Dathan and Abiram was evidently known to the writer of Deut. xi. 6 as a distinct incident, and a careful examination of the evidence shows that it deals with a dispute against the civil authority of Moses. With this has been woven an account of Korah's rebellion, also composite, with very clear evidence for the presence of two distinct views. In one (*a*), Korah and his followers protest against the Levitical rights enjoyed by Moses and Aaron; the malcontents themselves are not Levites (in Num. xxvii. 3, it is assumed that Manassites could have been included), and the sequel is intended to uphold the pre-eminence of the tribe of Levi against the rest of Israel. But in the other narrative (*b*), Korah and other Levites lay claim to serve as priests upon an equality with Aaron; the point at issue is not Levites *versus* laity, but the right to the priesthood, which is now secured for Aaron and his seed alone.

Now, both *a* and *b* are clearly due to P and it does not need to be shown that *b* is merely a later development of *a* in accordance with the development of hierarchical institutions. But the very circumstance that a post-exilic writer has supplemented *a* in order to find a precedent for the degradation of the Levites is a noteworthy sign, inasmuch as it is by no means improbable that *a* itself represents the results of previous development. The study of the Levitical institutions, taken with the internal features of the Levitical genealogies, is enough to show that there were many stages before the schemes reached their present finished state, and since it has been found that the traditions of the wanderings have developed upon definite lines, we are perhaps entitled to argue that if the *late* narratives have so much to say in Num. xvi sq. regarding the Levites of the *later* ages, the *earlier* records were not silent regarding their *earlier* fortunes. Moreover, since it has been seen that related subjects were treated in the same context and have subsequently suffered rearrangement and adjustment, there is a strong presumption that the existing narratives in Num. xvi sq. should be closely connected with the account of the Levites in Exod. xxxii. In point of fact, it is found that Num. xvi sq. stands in a position locating the

incident at Kadesh¹, and that this was also the scene of Exod. xxxii. 25 sqq. can be argued on independent grounds (see Deut. xxxiii. 8 sq.).

When, further, we proceed to consider the general trend of P's complete narratives we find an interesting analogy. The post-exilic passages, it must be remembered, are not of one strain, and whilst they appear to represent the normal development of earlier traditions in some cases, in others they show signs of specific modification in accordance with post-exilic ritual. Now, the first seven chapters of Leviticus form a group by themselves and interrupt the connexion between Exod. xxxv-xl and Lev. viii (itself an expansion), and the main thread of P, which ceases in Exod. xxix, is resumed in Lev. ix.² Accordingly, if we confine ourselves to the self-contained post-exilic cycle, we find the following sequence: the arrangements for the tabernacle³, the sacred vestments for Aaron and his sons and the consecration of the priests. Next, the original account of the construction of the tabernacle and of the consecration of the Aaronites has been replaced by an amplified account, of secondary origin, and upon this follows the offering of the first sacrifices (Lev. ix). Finally, immediately after this the two eldest sons offend against the ritual by offering unhallowed fire in their censers and are consumed by Yahweh's flame (Lev. x).

There is no doubt that this continuous record presents another stage in the history of the priesthood. It is no longer the supremacy of Levites over laity or of Aaronites over Levites, but of the younger of Aaronite divisions over the older "sons." Aaron's position is assured, and the conflicts which mark the subsequent (but earlier) narratives are virtually presupposed. It is only necessary to observe the sequence and to consider the relative position of allied incidents to infer that this record has been based upon older sources referring to events before the journey was undertaken. We have already seen that the older description of the tent of meeting and the account of its construction (there presupposed) was in close connexion with the old account of the institution of the Levites, and it seems to be not improbable that as the hierarchy developed, the traditions developed simultaneously. Hence, if we can assume a number of traditions (of different ages) proceeding upon the same general lines,

¹ P's theory, that the Israelites had not reached Kadesh (see Num. xx. 1) does not affect the argument.

² See Addis, ii. 290 sq.; *Hex.* p. 152; G. F. Moore, *Ency. Bib.*, col. 2777.

³ Its ark, table, and candlestick remind us of the equipment of the ordinary chamber; cp. 2 Kings iv. 10 (but that the ark was originally a throne or seat, like *סִפֵּה* in the passage in Kings, is far from certain).

we may conjecture that the story of the two sons of Aaron and also that of Korah occupied the same relative position. In fact, Bacon has already suggested that Nadab and Abihu were the original offenders in the story of the election of the Levites, and since the names occur in an old source it is extremely probable that some older and fuller record of them existed ¹.

It is at least interesting that when the two sons were devoured by the divine fire, Moses quotes the words of Yahweh: "I will show myself holy (קדש) in them that are nigh unto me" (Lev. x. 3). These words find an echo in Num. xx. 12 sq. on the occasion of the punishment of Moses and Aaron at *Kadesh*, and that the writer in that passage is playing upon the name is beyond dispute. Since the story of Nadab and Abihu belongs to a context which appears originally to have belonged to *Kadesh*, it is not improbable that the words of Moses are another play upon the name. Further, the nature of the offence of the Aaronites associates itself with the revolt of Korah in the fact that when Yahweh distinguishes the holy and chooses those who may approach him, Korah and his company are ordered to offer fire in their censers. The allusion to the selection and the sequel of the incident imply that there was some test whereby the Korahites were severed from the rest of the people, but the sources are incomplete, although the evident importance of the censers (Num. xvi. 36 sqq.) suggests some closer connexion with Lev. x. 1-5 at an earlier stage ².

It will now perhaps be clear that we possess a complex of stories, some of a distinct prophetic stamp (Num. xi. 24-29, xii), whilst others are associated more closely with priestly standpoints. To give these passages the attention they deserve would necessitate a complete survey of the history of Israel. What is important for the present purpose is to lay emphasis upon the unmistakable and orderly progress of tradition in conformity with the actual development of Israelite institutions. As already indicated, the superiority of Levites over the people gives expression to an historic fact, and in the

¹ Accordingly there would be some support for the view that Exod. xxiv. 1, 2, 9-11 (where they are brought before God) is the account of their election, corresponding to the election of the Levites (see also above, pp. 748 sq.). It is possible, moreover, that when the account of the wanderings was constructed, some such story as this was associated with the "burning" at Taberah (see *h* above).

² This would explain the insertion of Num. xv, with its laws on burnt-offerings, &c., and since the position of Eleazar (xvi. 37) presupposes the death of his elder brothers, it might be intelligible why this event is not noted here, but is duly mentioned elsewhere; see iii. 4, xxvi. 69 (cp. also 1 Chron. xxiv. 2).

supremacy of Aaronites over Levites, and in the elevation of certain Aaronite divisions over others, we are able to recognize that later changes in the hierarchy have been reflected in the story of the nation's birth. On the analogy of the Levitical genealogies we are entitled to expect an earlier stage where Mosaic divisions were supplanted by Aaronite, and evidence for this is actually found. Accordingly, we are entitled to consider further whether there could not be found other early stages which would illustrate the Mosaic divisions and the origin of the Levites¹.

For the present, there seems to be sufficient evidence for the conclusion² that Kadesh was the original objective of the wanderings of the Israelites, not after the digression to Sinai, but after crossing the Yam Sûph; it was also the original scene of the legislation, and of the incidents (at all events in their oldest form) now distributed over the route.

The present prominence of Sinai-Horeb must be connected, it would seem, with the insertion of the body of laws in Exod. xx-xxiii. Misplaced incidents lead up to the relatively advanced material there incorporated, whilst heavily redacted passages (comprising relatively ancient theophany, laws, and institutions), have the appearance of belonging to the same context, but in reality belong to Kadesh. So far from assuming that Sinai-Horeb³ is to be located in the immediate neighbourhood of Kadesh, the evidence of Exod. xiii. 17 seems to point conclusively in another direction. According to this verse, the Israelites did not journey by the land of the Philistines lest they should repent at the sight of war, and this must imply some detour (to the south of the Sinaitic peninsula or to Midian), since no sooner did they reach the wilderness of Shur (in the district of Kadesh) than they were in the very region to be avoided and conflicts actually ensued (*a* above). This suggests that when the secondary tradition with its later laws (on Sinai-Horeb) found a place in the history, it was introduced by means of Exod. xiii. 17 sq., and that incidents and passages originally relating to Kadesh were used

¹ That certain of the Levitical divisions were derived from names associated with Moses is clear (see *Ency. Bib.*, col. 1665). Now in Exod. iv. 13-16, before Moses receives the promise of the help of Aaron the Levite, he incurs in some obscure manner the wrath of Yahweh. The latter detail associates itself, as has been seen, with the pre-eminence of Caleb (Deut. i. 36 sq.), and again with the institution of the Levites. It will be necessary, therefore, to consider whether, on independent grounds, any relation can be found between Caleb, Moses, and the Levites.

² Already urged by Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, p. 343), H. P. Smith (*O. T. Hist.*, pp. 62, 69), and others, but here developed.

³ The possibility that there were two distinct places must be allowed.

to build up the account of the detour from the Yam Sûph to Sinai and from Sinai to Kadesh. To argue that the holy mountain was near Kadesh is difficult in the face of Exod. xiii. 17, and the data by which the view has been supported are far from conclusive. If a people whose goal lay northwards from Egypt marched in any other direction it seems safer to admit conflicting traditions than to attempt to reconcile them¹.

Several instructive lessons regarding the methods of editors can be gleaned from a consideration of the foregoing narratives², but the chief point which it is desired to emphasize in this section is the great prominence of Kadesh, and its stories of "striving" in early tradition.

¹ A distinction should properly be drawn between events originally located at Kadesh and those which are due to the secondary tradition and rightly belong to Sinai-Horeb. But it is not easy to see how much really belongs to the latter. The "priests which come near to Yahweh" (Exod. xix. 22) imply an institution originally at Kadesh; on Exod. iv. 13-16, see above (p. 749). Deuteronomy, it will have been noticed, at times refers to traditions which are not those actually preserved in Exodus or Numbers, but very closely allied to them. Its isolated details prove how continuous was the work of redaction, and render the attempt to sketch the stages of development almost an impossibility. There has been too much action and reaction of traditions upon each other, and from these adjustments Deuteronomy itself is not free. It may be conjectured that one of the first steps was to represent Horeb or Sinai as the scene of events at Kadesh, and so, whilst Moses, Aaron, and Miriam suffer punishment or death at Kadesh, this is already anticipated by offences at Horeb or Hazeroth. The account of the journey from Horeb to Kadesh was then built up by borrowing narratives belonging to Kadesh, and so we find that Massah (properly associated with Meribah, i.e. Kadesh) becomes one of the stations. This form of the tradition lay before the author of Deut. ix. 22, but in his time the story of the calf differed from the present narrative in one remarkable detail (ibid. ver. 20). Along with this, there grew up the tradition of the dangers and perils of the wilderness which the Deuteronomic tradition places at one time between Horeb and Kadesh (i. 19) and at another time after the departure from Kadesh (viii. 15). From Deut. i. 9-17 it is evident that the narrative of the journey from Egypt to Horeb had not reached its present form (on Exod. xviii, see above, p. 748), and although xxv. 17-19 knows of the Amalekite hostility as Israel came out of Egypt, it mentions fresh details (ver. 18), does not appear to know of Israel's victory, and on internal grounds can hardly be due to the compiler.

² There are no *a priori* reasons why such methods should have been confined to the Pentateuch.

It has been concluded that the place where Jethro or Hobab came to visit Moses and the Israelites was evidently somewhat distant from his "land" and "kindred," and, therefore, was neither Sinai nor Horeb, but in all probability Kadesh. The commencement of the journey from Kadesh as narrated in Num. x. 29 sqq. is only a fragment, and has to be considered in the light of other related passages. Now in Num. xxi. 1-3, it is found that the journey has been continued successfully as far as Hormah, that is, about half-way from Kadesh to Beersheba. But at this point there is a sudden diversion, and henceforward the journey becomes a long detour round to the east of the Jordan. The traditions here become somewhat confused and contradictory. In the story of the spies, Caleb alone, in the oldest narrative, proves his faith, on which account he and his seed receive the promise of inheritance (Num. xiv. 24, cp. Deut. i. 36). But the rest of the people incur the displeasure of Yahweh and are punished, and when in defiance of his word and without the presence of the ark the attempt is made to press onwards, a severe defeat is inflicted upon them in the district of Hormah (xiv. 41-45). Next, an attempt is made to pass Edom, and a composite passage narrates (a) an unsuccessful embassy from Kadesh to the king of Edom, and (b) an armed resistance on the part of the Edomites apparently after Israel had started (xx. 14-22). At this stage, it is found necessary to turn back to the Yam Sûph (here obviously the Gulf of 'Akabah), and in agreement with the command already given in the story of the spies (xiv. 25), the journey is taken by the south end of Edom. The fluctuation of tradition already manifest is emphasized when it is observed that according to Deut. ii. 4, 9 Edom and Moab were passive, and that P seems to have supposed that Israel crossed the northern end of Edom¹. It is important, therefore, to bear in mind the two main lines of route to Moab, the one from Kadesh, the other from the Yam Sûph. Even in Num. xxi, although the Israelites pass over the Arnon and reach Pisgah (vv. 16-20), in another representation they keep outside Moab (ver. 11 b); it is evident that the interpretation of these passages, as also of the defeat of Sihon the Amorite, depends upon the history of Moab and the known variation of its boundaries. The historical background, however, need not be considered here, and it is unnecessary to determine whether opportunity has not been seized in the chapters which follow to represent conditions of much later date. On the other hand, it is to be observed that the growth of the literary tradition of the Exodus is exemplified in the fact that the Balaam narratives (Num. xxii-xxiv), and P's supplementary material, partly based upon them break

¹ See Num. xxxiii, and Gray, *Numbers*, p. 282.

the connexion between the accounts of the conquest of the country east of the Jordan now preserved in Num. xxi and xxxii¹. These events bring us to Shittim, the prelude to Joshua's conquest of Palestine from the east, where again a fresh cycle of tradition becomes prominent (XVIII, 539 above).

It is natural to infer that since so much emphasis is laid upon Caleb's faith, the traditions hardly made him share the punishment inflicted upon the rest of the people. Subsequently we find traces of independent efforts of Caleb (the clan) to settle in the neighbourhood of Hebron, and the clan of Hobab, who was invited to accompany Israel (from Kadesh) actually captures Zephath and gives it the new name of Hormah (Judges i). Hence there is a very strong probability that the successful start from Kadesh and the victory at Hormah led to a direct movement northwards, and that the clans or tribes which succeeded in reaching the stage mentioned in Num. xxi. 1-3 did *not* take any part in the journey round to the Jordan (see XVIII, 352 sq. above).

It is not impossible that the fact that an initial reverse occurred at Hormah supplied the motive for the account of the disaster which is narrated in xiv. 41-45; although it might be preferable to regard the aim of the whole chapter as an attempt to furnish an explanation of the lengthy detour. On the other hand, the tradition of the detour round by the Gulf of 'Akabah does not stand alone, and the intricacy of the literary evidence makes the problem of the forty years' delay almost hopeless. Kadesh could naturally be the starting-point for a journey northwards into Judah, or around the south end of the Dead Sea to the land of Moab, but a deliberate movement from Kadesh towards the Yam Sûph does not appear likely. Perhaps it may be suggested that it is an attempt to reconcile the above traditions (with Kadesh as centre) with the independent account of a journey from the Gulf of 'Akabah northwards into Moab.

The two leading traditions which underlie the history of Israel are those of an entry into Palestine, one from the south and the other from the east. With the former we can at present associate Caleb and the Kenites, in the latter Joshua is evidently the leading figure. These two views seem to have grown up separately, and there is evidence that each underwent a considerable amount of development. It is clear that the prevailing view of the conquest (cp. also

¹ *Old* fragments have been preserved in xxxii. 39-42. These deal with clans of Manasseh, and the same tribe comes to the fore in the post-exilic xxvii. The rest of xxxii narrates the request of Reuben and Gad to settle in the pasture-lands of Gilead. In view of the *possible* dependence of late passages upon earlier sources these contents are worthy of notice, and will be referred to later.

Judges i) represents independent movements as part of a common undertaking after Gilgal had been reached. Whatever may be the original traditions of individual tribes or clans, when these become incorporated with other tribes which have their own traditions, many fundamental changes must ensue. Conflicting views are fused, attempts are made to effect a reconciliation, and several stages are traversed before final results are reached. The traditions of X may adapt themselves to Y, or the reverse; in the case of Caleb, the traditions of the less have simply become merged into that of the greater. In the traditions of the invasion of Palestine from the east we have a finished scheme, one which combines conflicting views and endeavours to harmonize them. But of the invasion from the south only isolated indications have survived and even these have not escaped rigorous treatment¹. However, when it is related in Num. xxi. 1-3 that "Israel" took part in the capture of Hormah, it seems possible that the attempt was even made to generalize the "Calebite" tradition, and this tendency may appear again when Joshua finds a place in the story of the spies and takes part in the overthrow of Amalek (Ex. xvii. 8-16, a pale reflection of Num. xxi. 1-3)².

It remains now to consider the provisional epithet "Calebite" which has been attached to the tradition of the journey into Judah. What evidence is there for the constitution of the tribes or clans which made this journey? Already it has been seen that Caleb, one of the spies, appears later in the *negeb* of Judah, and the clan of the father-in-law of Moses, the nomad Kenites, are subsequently found, now in Judah and now in the north of Palestine at Kadesh-Naphtali. In P's narrative in Exod. xxxi. 2, we find that Bezalel ben Uri ben Hur takes part in the construction of the tabernacle. We have found that P's material cannot be wholly ignored, and on *a priori* grounds it could be conjectured that the notice is derived

¹ Observe the scantiness of Num. x. 29 sqq., and the treatment of Calebite traditions in Joshua xiv. 6-15, xv. 14-19 (above, XVIII, 352 sq.).

² On the relation between (1) Num. xxi. 1-13 followed by the *successful* movement northwards (xxi. 1-3), and (2) the parallel story in Exod. xvii. 1-7 followed by the *defeat* of Amalek, see above, p. 746. In Num. xxi. 1-3 the idea seems to be, not that Caleb entered from the east (as in Judges i), but that Israel accompanied Caleb northwards into Judah. In Num. xiv the inclusion of Joshua admits, naturally enough, of other explanations, although if it was thought that the future leader of the Israelites did not incur guilt when the spies were sent, it was forgotten that he evidently suffered the punishment of the forty years' delay. Some allowance must always be made for the possibility that passages were revised at a period when the "Calebite" tradition as a distinct movement had been suppressed or forgotten.

from an older source¹. It must be admitted that many of P's names are worthless as evidence for the period to which they are attached, but since Bezalel in 1 Chron. ii. 19 sq. is said to belong to the Calebites it seems extremely probable that P is trustworthy in this instance. For, it is not easy to see why the genealogist should invent this information; nay rather, his aim is obviously to incorporate Calebites among the descendants of Judah, and consequently the probability is that he is manipulating his evidence, and not fabricating it. There is no apparent reason why he should make Uri a grandson of Caleb unless the belief prevailed that Bezalel was a Calebite, and since P itself calls Bezalel a Judaeon (in agreement with the aim of 1 Chron. ii), it seems justifiable to conclude that an earlier source (in agreement with the earlier representation) would have regarded the famous artificer as a member of the southern clan. That this would be extremely appropriate in the account of a "Calebite" migration is at once obvious. As regards his partner Aholiab the Danite, the evidence is more complicated, and must be viewed in the light of all the available evidence bearing upon the relations of Calebites and Kenites to other clans².

STANLEY A. COOK.

¹ Cp. the case of Nadab and Abihu.

² See, in the meanwhile, XVIII, 354 above.

(To be concluded.)